

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/081,964	SUOMELA ET AL.
	Examiner Steven B. Theriault	Art Unit 2179

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Steven B. Theriault. (3) _____.

(2) Geza Ziegler. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 07 October 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 14 and 24.

Identification of prior art discussed: Amro et al. (5,515,486).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner initiated contact with applicant regarding the limitations as recited in claims 1, 14 and 24 in response to an amendment filed on 08/04/2005. The examiner spoke to the primary in the art unit regarding the state of the prior art and the allowability of the claims. The examiner suggested to the applicant that a different combination of the claims would distinguish the invention over the prior art. The applicant responded with a new supplemental amendment to the claims in which the claims now recite the means for rotating the interface in response to movement by the user of the mobile device and where all facets of the interface are visible in the 3D polyhedron.